

MEETING MINUTES
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
TRANSIT COMMITTEE

June 10, 2010

Maricopa Association of Governments Office
302 North First Avenue, Suite 200, Saguaro Room
Phoenix, Arizona

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Phoenix: Debbie Cotton, Chair	Mesa: Mike James
*ADOT: Mike Normand	Paradise Valley: William Mead
Avondale: Rogene Hill	Peoria: David Moody for Maher Hazine
#Buckeye: Andrea Marquez	*Queen Creek: Wendy Kaserman
Chandler: RJ Zeder	Scottsdale: Theresa Huish
*El Mirage: Pat Dennis	Surprise: Michael Celaya
Gilbert: Michelle Gramley for Tami Ryall	Tempe: Jyme Sue McLaren
Glendale: Cathy Colbath	*Tolleson: Chris Hagen
Goodyear: Cato Esquivel	Valley Metro Rail: Wulf Grote
Maricopa County: Mike Sabatini for Mitch Wagner	Regional Public Transportation Authority: Carol Ketcherside

* Members neither present nor represented by proxy. + - Attended by Videoconference
- Attended by Audioconference

OTHERS PRESENT

Kevin Wallace, MAG	Jorie Bresnahan, Phoenix
Marc Pearsall, MAG	Stephanie Child, Phoenix
Alice Chen, MAG	Bob Ciotti, Phoenix
Maureen DeCindis, MAG	Ken Kessler, Phoenix
Micah Henry, MAG	Wendy Miller, Phoenix
Steve Tate, MAG	Bob Antila, RPTA
Eileen Yazzie, MAG	Dawn Coomer, Tempe
Kristen Sexton, Avondale	Robert Yabes, Tempe
Brent Stoddard, Glendale	Bryan Copp, HDR
Jim Huling, Mesa	Brad Bielenberg, Otak
Jeff Martin, Mesa	Leslie Dornfeld, Plan+ET
Holly Hassett, METRO	Lauren Neu, Strand

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 1:31 p.m. by Chair Debbie Cotton. Chair Cotton welcomed everyone in attendance and announced that a quorum was present. She introduced one member of the Transit Committee, Ms. Andrea Marquez who was participating via teleconference. She asked if there were any public comment cards, and there being none, proceeded to the next item on the agenda.

2. Approval of Draft May 13, 2010 Minutes

Chair Cotton asked if there were any comments or corrections to the May 13, 2010 meeting minutes. Hearing no comments or corrections to the meeting minutes, Chair Cotton called for a motion to approve the draft minutes. Mr. Dave Moody moved to approve the minutes. Mr. Robert Yabes seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

3. Call to the Audience

Chair Cotton stated that she had not received any request to speak cards from the audience and moved onto the next item on the agenda.

4. Transit Program Manager's Report

Chair Cotton introduced Mr. Kevin Wallace from MAG to provide the Transit Program Manager's Report. Mr. Wallace explained that there were copies of the Executive Summary of the Transit Framework Study available for the Committee members online, CD and by hard copy.

Mr. Wallace mentioned that MAG staff was working on a new resolution that would be going before the MAG Management Committee and Regional Council in July. He explained the resolution would support the expansion of Amtrak passenger service into the Phoenix metropolitan as part of the National Intercity Rail Network. He stated that Phoenix is currently the largest city in the nation without Amtrak intercity passenger rail, having lost the service in June 1996. Chair Cotton expressed support for returning Amtrak service to the Valley and MAG Region.

Ms Rogene Hill inquired if there were any current Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) studies on the return of Amtrak to the MAG Region. Mr. Wallace replied that ADOT had submitted for a federal grant that would allow ADOT to study how to bring Amtrak back through the Valley using Union Pacific's Wellton Branch railroad west of Phoenix. He stated that the competitive grant was due to be awarded in the fall and MAG contributed matching funds to ADOT in an effort to secure the grant.

Hearing no further comments, Chair Cotton proceeded to the next item on the agenda.

5. Federal Fiscal Year 2010 Program of Projects for 5307 & 5309 FTA Funds

Chair Cotton introduced Ms. Eileen Yazzie of MAG to explain the Federal Fiscal Year 2010 Program of Projects for 5307 & 5309 Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Funds.

Ms. Yazzie stated that she had previously emailed two tables and a memo. She stated that both tables pertained to the Phoenix-Mesa and Avondale UZA (Urbanized Areas) funds and 5309 for fixed guideway modernization. She mentioned that for the Program of Projects, the region received apportionments and allocations of FTA funds and that MAG had to reconcile differences and make needed modifications in order to proceed and stay on time with the FY2010 grant process. She noted that Mr. Ken Kessler of the City of Phoenix would discuss the grant process later in the agenda. Ms. Yazzie summarized the five topic items for her presentation, which included the difference between current Program of Projects and Allocations; the 5307 Phoenix/Mesa UZA Program of Projects; the 5307 Avondale UZA; and the 5309 –FGM. She stated the item was on the agenda for discussion and action.

Next Ms. Yazzie discussed the difference between current 2010 Projects and Allocations. Ms. Yazzie noted that the Transit Committee previously had recommended modifications to the FY09-10 and 2011-15 projects. The modifications were to projects in the MAG FY2008-12 TIP and the Draft FY2011-15 TIP. She explained there were changes and a difference in what was approved in March and the actual allocations.

Ms. Yazzie noted that the FFY 2010 apportionment for 5307 Urbanized Area funds were \$49,837,007 for the Phoenix/Mesa UZA and \$1,000,309 for the Avondale UZA. She noted the total amount of projects programmed for 2010 in the current FY2008-2012 MAG TIP with 5307 funds for the Phoenix/Mesa UZA were \$49,575,696 and \$1,049,778 for the Avondale UZA. She explained that the FFY2010 apportionment for 5309 Fixed Guideway Modernization (FGM) was \$3,648,847 for the Phoenix/Mesa UZA and that the total amount of funds programmed for 2010 in the current 2008-2012 MAG TIP with 5309 FGM funds for the Phoenix/Mesa UZA were \$4,185,473.

Ms. Yazzie further explained that adjustments needed to be made for projects programmed with 5307 and 5309 FGM in 2010 to complete the 2010 Program of Projects for the MAG region to move forward with Federal Transit Administration (FTA) grant requests. She stated the changes would effect the projects programmed in the DRAFT 2011-2015 MAG TIP. She also noted that in the 2010 Program of Projects, the FFY 2010 apportionment for 5307-Phoenix/Mesa UZA was \$49,837,007. She explained the total amount of projects programmed for 2010 in the current 2008-2012 MAG TIP was \$49,575,696 with a difference of \$261,000 that needed to be adjusted so that the region could use the full allocation.

Ms. Yazzie detailed the current programming steps: (1) the region needed to adjust the federal required 1% enhancement project (PHX-901TB) down from \$507,532 to \$498,370 to match the 1% allocation; (2) the new balance of funds to be programmed after step 1: \$270,473; and there was a regional/MAG preventative maintenance project approved by the Committee in March designed to capture those funds. She suggested programming the preventative maintenance regional funds of \$2,074,797 and the balance of funds of \$270,473 to the current operators that had preventative maintenance projects programmed at the current allocations.

Discussion followed.

Ms. Yazzie discussed the 2010 Program of Projects for the 5307 Avondale UZA. She stated that the FFY 2010 apportionment for 5307 Urbanized Area funds was \$ 1,000,309 for the Avondale UZA; however the amount programmed for 2010 in the FY 2008-2012 MAG TIP was \$1,049,778. She explained the federal share for the project needed to be lowered to meet the funding allocation.

Moving on, Ms. Yazzie explained that the FFY2010 apportionment for 5309 Fixed Guideway Modernization (FGM) was \$3,648,847, but the total amount programmed for 2010 in the FY 2008-2012 MAG TIP was \$4,185,473. She suggested lowering the federal share for the project, Glendale, Bell/101 (acquire ROW for park and ride) by \$536,626 to meet the apportionment. She added that the balance of funds needed for the project would need to be programmed in 2011, yet there was currently a ROW phase programmed in FY2011 in the DRAFT 2011-2015 TIP. In closing, Ms. Yazzie noted that the item was on the agenda for action.

Chair Cotton asked if there were any questions or comments for Ms. Yazzie.

Hearing no further questions or comments for Ms. Yazzie, Chair Cotton called for a motion to approve the action item. Mr. RJ Zeder motioned to recommend approval to amend and modify the 2008-2012 MAG TIP for projects to be funded with 5307 and 5309-FGM funds in 2010 for the 2010 Program of Projects. Mr. David Moody seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

Chair Cotton thanked Ms. Yazzie for her presentation and proceeded to the next item on the agenda.

6. Programming the Transit Component of the DRAFT 2011-2015 MAG TIP

Ms. Eileen Yazzie proceeded with an explanation of the Programming the Transit Component of the DRAFT 2011-2015 MAG TIP. Ms. Yazzie stated an administrative error had been detected regarding the revenue stream projections between the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). After concurrence with RPTA staff, both agencies agreed that the revenue projections needed to be revised for compliance with the numbers reflected in the RTP.

Ms. Yazzie summarized the three topic items under review for her second presentation: (1) the difference between March 2010 and Current Revenue Projections; (2) steps to adjust 2011-2015 TIP; and (3) Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ).

She noted that MAG staff had continued to work on the development of the DRAFT FY2011-2015 MAG TIP and discovered lower than projected estimates. Ms. Yazzie explained that the projected revenue streams for 5307 Urbanized Area for the Phoenix UZA and the 5309 – Fixed Guideway Modernization for 2011-2015 were lower than anticipated by a total of about \$20 million over the five year period. The total changes equated to approximately \$15.5 million less in the 5307 category and \$4 million less in the 5309 category.

Ms. Yazzie also acknowledged that on March 11, 2010, the MAG Transit Committee recommended approval of the amendments and modifications to the MAG FY2008-2012 TIP, and approval of the Listing of Transit Projects to be included in the DRAFT FY2011-2015 MAG TIP. She mentioned that the region utilized the Regionwide / MAG Preventative Maintenance projects that were originally programmed in March 2010 for the balances of 5307 funds in 2011, 2013, and 2015. These three projects were lowered from a collective 5307 funding at \$36,850,017 to \$21,899,149. She also noted that some projects had funding split or modified over 2 years and with different funds.

Ms. Yazzie's presentation detailed each year from Draft FY2011-2015. She stated that FY2011 included Preventative Maintenance (PM) a 1% enhancement adjustment, and the modified Glendale ROW and construction for park and ride. FY2012 included a 1% enhancement adjustment, with the Glendale construction funds for the park and ride lowered and moved to FY2011, with construction for the Phoenix park and ride lowered and moved to 2013 (costs fit into 2013 5309 balance), and with Valley Metro bus purchases lowered and moved to 2013. She noted that the FY2013 included a 2014 1% enhancement adjustment, Valley Metro Scottsdale ROW adjusted with the balance moved to FY2015, with the original program of two phases of ROW purchases. The FY2015 components included Preventative Maintenance and a 1% enhancement adjustment, with Valley Metro-Scottsdale ROW adjusted and the balance moved to FY2015 and the original program of 2 phases of ROW.

Ms Yazzie reminded the Committee that the MAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) allocated 35.9% of the regions Congestion Mitigation Air Quality funds (CMAQ), and that CMAQ funds were allocated to the region from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). She reported that the CMAQ allocation funding projections for Rail Transit projects, had been confirmed and modifications to the rail transit projects were requested to meet funding projections and project schedules. She stated that to meet the fiscal constraint requirement of the MAG TIP, the transit projects programmed in FY2011-2015 with 5307, 5309, and CMAQ fund needed to be revised.

She explained steps taken to adjust projects for the DRAFT 2011-2015 MAG TIP. She announced that the March 2010 recommended projects did not fully utilize the March 2010 5309-FGM projected revenue stream.

Ms. Yazzie summarized that the item was on the agenda for information, discussion and possible action for the recommended approval for the project changes to the transit listing of projects for inclusion in the DRAFT FY2011-2015 TIP. Chair Cotton asked if there were any questions or comments for Ms. Yazzie.

Ms. Jyme Sue McLaren asked if RPTA reviewed the requested changes. Ms. Yazzie replied that RPTA staff had been provided the information and reviewed all of the recommended changes. Ms. McLaren suggested that it would be prudent to have Tempe Transit Operations staff review the document. Ms. Yazzie replied that the information had been passed out to all MAG members and RPTA earlier in the month. Discussion followed.

Ms. Carol Ketcherside concurred that the document warranted more dialogue and review. She stated that RPTA was not prepared to respond to this item on the agenda. She asked if the Scottsdale Road Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) was a placeholder as there was uncertainty over

whether the item qualified for Fixed Guideway Modernization Funds. Discussion followed.

Ms. Cathy Colbath inquired about the process for the changes and the timeframe for a decision and notifying the affected jurisdiction. Ms. Yazzie responded that as technical advisory committee, MAG and the Region looked to the Transit Committee members for guidance. She noted that the Committee was expected to communicate and notify the member agencies' own technical and operations staff in a timely manner, in order to be prepared to make decisions at the Transit Committee meetings.

Ms. Yazzie noted there was a time constraint at present as the Draft TIP FY2011-15 was already on the Transportation Review Committee (TRC) Agenda to be heard on June 29th. She added that due to its expedited schedule and deadline, it was imperative that the Transit Committee act on the item as soon as possible.

Ms. McLaren recommended that the Committee defer official action so that Tempe Transit Operations staff and other agencies may review and endorse changes. Mr. David Moody of the City of Peoria suggested that RPTA and Tempe approve their sections in order for the Transit Committee to ensure that the item can be heard by the TRC. Ms. Yazzie stated that that would be appropriate.

Chair Cotton recommended that the Committee meet again shortly to approve the item. Mr. Wallace advised returning for a Special Meeting within two weeks. Discussion followed. Hearing no further questions or comments for Ms. Yazzie, Chair Cotton called for a motion to approve the action item. Ms. Colbath motioned to recommend meeting within two weeks in order to be prepared to move forward with a decision, at a date, time and location to be determined by MAG staff. Ms. Ketcherside seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

Chair Cotton thanked Ms. Yazzie for her two presentations and asked if there were any further questions or comments for Ms. Yazzie. She also thanked the Committee for the discussion and the importance of the rescheduled meeting. Hearing no further comments, Chair Cotton proceeded to the next item on the agenda.

7. Transit Federal Funding Grant Opportunities

Chair Cotton introduced Ms. Alice Chen from MAG to present an update on the Federal Transit Authority's (FTA) transit Federal Funding Grant Opportunities for information, discussion and possible action.

Ms Chen explained the outline of the various topics, and referred to the presentation on the purpose of the grants that the region may qualify for as well as the seven types of grant categories. She cited examples; State of Good Repair Bus and Bus Facilities Initiative; Clean Fuels Grant Program Augmented with Discretionary Bus and Bus Facilities Program; and Alternatives Analysis -Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA).

She stated that current trends in FTA funding reflected a preference for competitive discretionary grants, which were replacing Congressional earmarks. She noted that the FTA's needs and requests of all future applications were moving towards a recommended process of regional prioritization in lieu of competition between individual cities and projects within the

same region.

Ms. Chen explained the details of the State of Good Repair Bus and Bus Facilities Initiative and its evaluation criteria. The three guidelines were: planning and prioritization done at the local/regional level, the project was ready to implement and that there was technical, legal, and financial capacity to implement the particular project. She noted that for the State of Good Repair Bus and Bus Facilities Initiative, the six evaluation criteria consisted of: age of asset to be replaced or rehabilitated relative to its useful life; demonstrated backlog of deferred maintenance; consistent with fleet management plan; demonstrated positive impact on air quality; supports emerging technologies; and conforms to spare ratio guidelines. Ms. Chen detailed the State of Good Repair Bus and Bus Facilities Initiative grant and its four 'bus facilities' evaluation criteria; which included the age of asset to be replaced or rehabilitated relative to its useful life; demonstrated backlog of deferred maintenance; the support of emerging technologies; and compliance with "green Building" certification.

She further explained the six State of Good Repair Bus and Bus Facilities Initiative 'Asset Management' provisions: how plans/systems will be developed or upgraded; how inventories will be maintained physically and fiscally; how assets initial condition will be assessed; how assets will be inspected, monitored; use of support tools; demonstrated long term financial commitment.

Ms. Chen reviewed the Clean Fuels Grant Program evaluation criteria. She stated the program had five criteria which included: demonstrated need; planning and prioritization at the local/regional level; ready for implementation; demonstrated the benefits of the proposed project in reducing transportation related pollutants; that it supports emerging clean fuels technologies. She reviewed the Alternatives Analysis-Notice of Funds Availability(NOFA) which had available funding of \$25.7M, with a minimum/maximum of \$50k/\$2M. The evaluation criteria included: demonstrated need, technical capacity to carry out proposed work; and the potential impact on decision making. She announced that the FTA submittal deadline was July 12, 2010. She explained that eligible applicants could submit electronically through the FTA website. She also noted that eligible applicants were states, authorities of the states, metropolitan planning organizations, and local governmental authorities that may conduct alternatives analyses as defined by section 5309.

Chair Cotton thanked Ms Chen for her presentation and asked if there were any questions or comments. Ms. Hill inquired what the match requirements were for the grant. Ms. Chen indicated that the 83% FTA federal allocation required a 17% local match.

Mr. Mike James asked if there was a downside of not having a regional priority list. Ms. Chen replied that the FTA was encouraging regional coordination as it was beneficial in showing a unified effort for each region. She noted that they preferred the regional approach instead of individual cities soliciting grants on their own. She cited the recent example, as metropolitan Kansas City received a substantial FTA allocation for their unified efforts. She added that the FTA supported regionalism in their programs. Discussion continued.

Ms. Hill inquired what processes were in place to create a prioritized regional list of projects. Mr. Wallace responded and added a point of clarification. He noted that the Transit Committee

was not in front of the new grant applications because there had not been a process established for conversations to begin in ranking projects on a regional level. He noted that the Transit Committee must decide and establish regional project ranking criteria.

Chair Cotton added that the Committee is expecting some white papers this fall from MAG staff regarding elements of ranking processes, priorities, evaluation criteria, and other necessary resources.

Mr. Michael Celaya of the City of Surprise inquired that as the due date of July 12, did the applications need to go through the City of Phoenix. Ms. Chen replied that the grant application need not go through the designated recipient City of Phoenix, but rather directly through the FTA's website: www.grants.gov.

Mr. Wulf Grote added that as far as the FTA was concerned, there was a need for all cities in the region to rally around common projects, and that Valley cities shouldn't focus solely on individual projects if it put the region as a whole at a deficit. Discussion followed.

Mr. Dave Moody asked if it made sense for the region to get behind City of Phoenix garage improvements. Chair Cotton mentioned that there was willingness from Phoenix to sign off to make the approach more regional. Ms. Chen responded that due to the FTA's expedited schedule, the MAG region was left with little time for regional coordination on these grant applications as action was needed in order to advance the list of candidate project. Discussion followed.

Chair Cotton thanked Ms. Chen for her presentation and asked if there were any further questions or comments.

Chair Cotton called for a motion to approve the action item and proceed with the Federal Funding Grant Opportunities grant applications submittal. Mr. RJ Zeder of the City of Chandler motioned to approve the action item. Mr. David Moody of the City of Peoria seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

Hearing no further comments, Chair Cotton proceeded to the next item on the agenda.

8. Update on the Tempe South High Capacity Transit Alternatives Analysis

Chair Cotton introduced Mr. Wulf Grote for an update on the Tempe South High Capacity Transit Alternatives Analysis.

Mr. Grote presented the Tempe South project and outlined the purpose of the Alternatives Analysis. He explained the elements of the study, specifically by mode (Light Rail Transit, Commuter Rail, Modern Streetcar and Bus Rapid Transit-BRT) and by corridor alignment/route (Rural Rd., McClintock Dr., Mill Ave., Kyrene Rd., and the Tempe Branch of the Union Pacific Railroad.)

Mr. Grote detailed recent actions by the City of Tempe, including April 2009 Tempe City

Council consensus to advance 2 RTP projects: the BRT on Rural Road on Mill Avenue including a bus/right turn lane from Baseline to University as this helped meet the FTA definition of BRT for possible Small Starts funding. In addition, Modern Streetcar on Mill / Southern Avenue was endorsed. In May 2010 the Tempe City Council issued a resolution to advance both Modern Streetcar and BRT, but with an early focus on streetcar due to funding availability limiting the implementation of the Rural Rd BRT.

Mr. Grote explained travel characteristics of the Tempe Districts. He stated North Tempe featured the CBD(Central Business District), and a pedestrian/transit friendly environs with high density neighborhoods and a regional employment center. He explained that the ASU District featured included region-wide special events generator and unique trip patterns with sizeable non-peak trip patterns. He noted that the South Tempe District included a commuter corridor with higher income residential and low density housing as well as low density employment.

He noted that the study revealed that there was not one transit solution for the area. He then presented details on the Rural Road Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) characteristics. He explained the Rural Road BRT capital cost estimate in 2010 dollars was \$60-\$65 million for 10.5 miles, which was approximately \$6.1 million per mile. He stated that the cost estimates included 11 vehicles, 14 stations, 2 park-and-rides and an annual operations and maintenance cost of \$3.1 million. He reported that Tempe would contribute \$2.1 million and Chandler would contribute \$1.0 million. He explained that the Rural Road BRT line was estimated to carry ridership of 5,200 to 5,700 per day in 2015, with its shared parallel local line Route 72 (Scottsdale Rd/Rural Rd) carrying approximately 1,200 to 1,300 per day.

Mr. Grote provided a summary of the bus Transit Life Cycle Program Update, the Public Transportation Fund (PTF) revenue shortfall. The bus shortfall alone was \$656 million, and because of the shortfall it was recommended that the current regional plan delay implementation of BRT on Rural Rd from 2015 to beyond 2026. He explained that Rural Road BRT would still be recommended for implementation, but it was currently unfunded, as capital and operating would have to be derived from currently inadequate PTF funding.

He then summarized the Modern Streetcar mode. It was described as a fixed-guideway electric rail system, operating in mixed traffic, with articulated vehicles for tight radii turns. The vehicles were smaller than light rail vehicles, with 130 passengers per vehicle (35 seated / 95 standing), and typically operating as a single car unit. The stations would be simple with a focus on being a catalyst for economic development, including the redevelopment of 125 acres within the corridor. The Modern Streetcar alignment options included mid-block placements on Mill Ave. in downtown Tempe. The study revealed that new development potential existed in the corridor, as local Tempe policies tend to support livable and walkable communities. He explained that the benefit-cost analysis isolated the incremental benefit of modern streetcar and was shown as fiscally appropriate for a city, such as Tempe. The benefit-to-cost ratio was equal to 1:3 and it was assumed that the Modern Streetcar ratio would improve as ridership increases. Then, Mr. Grote presented details on the Mill Avenue Modern Streetcar characteristics. He reported that the streetcar cost estimates, funding, and capital cost was \$162 million (YOE), approximately \$62.3 million per mile. This included 2.6 miles of track from Rio Salado/Mill to Southern /Mill. He explained the cost estimates included 5 vehicles, 9 stations, and operations and maintenance costs of \$3.1M (\$1.3M per mile (YOE)). He announced that

funding capital would be provided by Regional PTF, FTA Small Starts and CMAQ funds with operating funds provided by City of Tempe. He explained that the Modern Streetcar line was estimated to carry a 2015 ridership of 1,100 to 1,600 per day, excluding special events.

He stated that the reasons for advancing the Modern Streetcar recommendation. The streetcar would support affordable housing within the corridor, encourage redevelopment of underutilized parcels and complements Tempe's diversity of people and places. The streetcar also supported the local policies that provide and encourage diverse transportation choices by enhancing investment in downtown neighborhoods. He noted that the goal of the streetcar was to also be a major component in promoting livable city and green initiatives and mirroring FTA initiatives for sustainability and livability. The mode would also better-serve special events than non-guideway transit, and also supporting ASU travel demand by provide seamless connection to LRT near the campus.

Mr. Grote summarized the next steps for the study. Meetings with community groups, commissions and public would continue through the fall of 2010 and Tempe City Council action would be expected soon after. The Alternatives Analysis recommendations, Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) for FTA funding and MAG Regional Council approval, were all expected in the winter 2010 / spring 2011. Preparation of the application to enter FTA Project Development phase would occur in summer 2011 and in winter 2012 the project would begin engineering, pending FTA approval. Chair Cotton thanked Mr. Grote for his presentation and asked if there were any further questions or comments.

Ms. Colbath inquired how BRT and Streetcar would interact with METRO light rail. Mr. Grote replied that BRT's end of line station would be at Tempe Transportation Center (TTC) and that the modern Streetcar would offer direct connections to LRT in the vicinity of Mill Ave or ASU. Ms. McLaren also added that maintenance of the modern streetcar vehicles would be performed that the existing METRO OMC, as the tracks would be interlined in Tempe so that modern streetcars could access the METRO mainline and the maintenance facility.

Mr. James asked about the community input from the businesses and public. Mr. Grote responded that there had been a lot of interest, with the neighborhood advisory committee offering a mixed review of project, but majority of responders in support of the plan. The DTC (Downtown Tempe Community) had been engaged, especially with two options affecting downtown, Ash Avenue of Mill Avenue, in the mix of possible alignments.

Ms. Hill asked about the newer FTA initiatives for sustainability and livability showcasing the benefits of transit beyond cost-effectiveness and ridership and inquired when MAG may begin to use these other criteria in their studies. She noted that the Commuter Rail Study was primarily constrained by cost effectiveness and ridership. Mr. Wallace replied that the studies utilized existing and approved MAG evaluation criteria and guidelines and that the Transit Committee could identify and establish revised criteria for its own reviews, as this could feed into the review RTP this fall.

Chair Cotton thanked Mr. Grote for his presentation and asked if there were any further questions or comments. Hearing no further comments, Chair Cotton proceeded to the next item

on the agenda.

9. Overview of Federal Transit Administration Process

Chair Cotton introduced Mr. Ken Kessler of the City of Phoenix for his presentation and Overview of Federal Transit Administration Process

Mr. Kessler referred to his presentation and the agenda packet and explained the eight current Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Programs:

- Section 5307 Urbanized Area Formula;
- Flexible Funding for Highway & Transit
- CMAQ & STP funds transferred from Federal Highway Administration (FHWA);
- Section 5309 Fixed Guideway Modernization Formula;
- Section 5309 Bus and Bus Facilities;
- Section 5309 New Starts and Small Starts;
- Section 5316 Job Access & Reverse Commute; and
- Section 5317 New Freedom; and Section 5339 Alternatives Analysis.

He further provided an overview of the grant timelines. He added that the funding allocations were an appropriations act passed by Congress and signed by President with FTA apportionments and allocations published in the Federal Register. He mentioned that Phoenix conducts Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC) & New Freedom regional competitive selection processes and that MAG staff reconciled published funding amounts with the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). MAG allocates CMAQ closeout funds and initiates funds transfer from FHWA to FTA and that the State initiates transfer of STP-Flex funds from FHWA to FTA. Mr. Kessler gave further information on the TIP/STIP Update process. He noted that MAG staff presented proposed TIP amendments to the Transit Committee, then MAG staff prepared TIP amendments which were approved through MAG committee process. He stated that the TIP amendments were then forwarded by MAG to State for federal approval with MAG staff preparing Program of Projects and forwarding them to the City of Phoenix.

Mr. Kessler detailed the Application Development. He noted that it included a request to sub recipients for project information; with description/justification/scope; project cost estimate & funding sources; and estimated milestone dates. He mentioned that environmental documentation – the Categorical Exclusion (CE), Environmental Assessment (EA) , Environmental Impact Statement (EIS); Vehicle information–fleet status and vehicles to be replaced would all need to be entered on all application information and then submitted into FTA’s Transportation Electronic Award Management (TEAM) system.

Mr. Kessler explained that in the Application Pre-Submission Review; the City of Phoenix provided MAG staff with draft application for review and concurrence. Thereafter, MAG provided a concurrence letter to FTA with FTA Region IX staff performing a preliminary review. He noted that the City of Phoenix revised the draft application as applicable, with Phoenix distributing the grant pass through agreements to sub recipients. He added that in the Application Submission and Review; the City of Phoenix submitted complete application in

TEAM, followed with an FTA review application. He noted that it would then be forwarded to the Department of Labor (DOL); with the DOL sending out a letter and an application to initiate the certification process. He closed, explaining that unions have 15 days to review and reply; with the DOL addressing any union concerns and sending the letter certifying the grants.

Chair Cotton thanked Mr. Kessler for his presentation and asked if there were any further questions or comments.

Mr. Kevin Wallace requested clarification on the purposes and differences were in the Federal appropriation process and apportionment process. Mr. Kessler responded that the Federal appropriation was a higher level as this was the budget that each federal agency was allocated. He noted then the FTA would run their amount through formulas and earmarking, if any, which took additional time, so that all of the necessary documentation could be published in the Federal Register, which in turn reveals the actual apportioned amounts. He mentioned that the coordination between the two usually added about one month of duration to the process. Mr. Grote noted that as a part of its budget, the FTA also retained a small administrative fee from the appropriation before the full apportionment was distributed.

Chair Cotton thanked Mr. Kessler for his presentation and asked if there were any further questions or comments. Hearing no further comments, Chair Cotton proceeded to the next item on the agenda.

10. Sustainable Transportation and Land Use Integration Study

Chair Cotton introduced Mr. Kevin Wallace from MAG to present an update on the new MAG Sustainable Transportation and Land Use Integration Study.

Mr. Wallace mentioned that funding for the MAG Sustainable Transportation and Land Use integration Study was included in the FY 2011 MAG Work Program. He stated that the genesis for the study came directly out of the recently completed Regional Transit Framework and Commuter Rail Studies.

Mr. Wallace noted that the Sustainability study would emphasize strategies to promote sustainable transportation and encourage development patterns and densities necessary to support high capacity transit services. He added that the economic viability of implementation would be studied.

Mr. Wallace mentioned a sample of the study questions that would be major components within the study. Examples included: what constituted a sustainable transportation system; what was the role of transit in developing a sustainable transportation system in the MAG region; what density levels and development patterns were necessary to support BRT, LRT, and CRT, respectively; and lastly what was the economic viability of achieving these density levels in various locations throughout the MAG region. Additionally, what else was necessary to support efficient High Capacity Transit (HCT) services and should future HCT investments be focused in the central part of the region, or should the system be expanded to developing areas along the urban fringe (Scenarios 2 & 3 in Transit Framework); and what planning tools were needed to assist cities in preparing for future HCT services. This was followed by

discussions on HCT and BRT and Commuter Rail Corridors.

Mr. Wallace then explained the process of the study work. The study would designate a regionally appropriate definition of “Sustainable Transportation”. Further, in connecting activity centers, the study would identify transit’s role in the MAG Region. The study would also look at reallocated projected growth (2035) and the travel characteristics.

A Peer Review Panel would assist in reviewing the economic viability of the study recommendations as well as developing and evaluating three land use scenarios. The study would also look at density thresholds for HCT and guidance for implementing Transit Oriented Development (TOD) as well as developing an implementation strategy.

Mr. Wallace summarized the next steps. A finalized Request for Proposals (RFPs) would be advertised in July with an award September/October 2010, and a study duration of approximately 18-months.

Chair Cotton thanked Mr. Wallace for his presentation and asked if there were any further questions or comments.

Mr. James offered that when the region eventually began to define land use density, it should ensure that a variety of other criteria were included such as low cost housing and other data, which would be on par with the New Starts criteria.

Mr. Michael Celaya of the City of Surprise suggested that if grant linkages were possible, such as HUD and TIGER, this may help ensure the region’s competitiveness in securing the grants. Ms. McLaren asked if the three land use scenarios outcomes were known at this time and if they were transit specific.

Mr. Wallace replied that the outcomes would be based on transit linkages and that the three scenarios would be defined at a later date. Mr. Grote cited as an example that there was a new study for Arizona Avenue with the task of looking at what it would take to make the corridor more transit friendly.

Mr. Moody asked if the Draft Request For Proposals (RFP) was available yet. Mr. Wallace replied that it would be sent out for review and input by the Transit Committee members. Further discussion followed. Chair Cotton mentioned that the Committee was looking forward to seeing the Draft RFP.

Chair Cotton thanked Mr. Wallace for his presentation and asked if there were any further questions or comments. Hearing no further comments, Chair Cotton proceeded to the next item on the agenda.

11. Request for Future Agenda Items

Chair Cotton asked the members of the Transit Committee if there were any issues that they would like added as future agenda items. Mr. Moody requested an item for the October/November time-frame. He suggested that MAG staff research and provide a summary list of all FTA capital improvement program grants that local jurisdictions traditionally apply for, but that could be converted into regional grant opportunities. He also inquired if the MAG Region would subsequently allow the jurisdictions to program those funds. Chair Cotton thanked Mr. Moody for his request.

Hearing no further comments, Chair Cotton proceeded to the next item on the agenda.

12. Next Meeting Date

Chair Cotton thanked those present for attending the MAG Transit Committee meeting. She announced that the next meeting of the MAG Transit Committee, a special meeting to discuss and take action on the TIP at the request of the committee, would be held on Tuesday June 22, 2010 at a time and conference room to be determined. There being no further business, Chair Cotton adjourned the meeting at 3:42 p.m.